

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

IN RE ) Docket No. 18 C 7686  
LION AIR FLIGHT JT 610 CRASH ) and related cases  
This Document Relates To: ) Chicago, Illinois  
All Actions ) March 5, 2019  
9:20 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Status  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS M. DURKIN

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs MR. STEVEN A. HART  
Cases 18 C 8484 Hart McLaughlin & Eldridge LLC  
and 18 C 8490: 22 W. Washington Street  
Suite 1600  
Chicago, IL 60602

For Plaintiffs MR. THOMAS P. ROUTH  
Cases 18 C 8006, Nolan Law Group  
19 C 1712, 20 N. Clark Street  
19 C 1714, and 30th Floor  
19 C 1715: Chicago, IL 60602

For Plaintiff MR. MICHAEL K. DEMETRIO  
Case 19 C 622: MR. ANDREW P. STEVENS  
Corboy & Demetrio PC  
33 N. Dearborn Street  
Suite 2100  
Chicago, IL 60602

For Plaintiffs MR. JOHN R. WRONA  
Case 19 C 797: Gardiner Koch Weisberg & Wrona  
53 W. Jackson Boulevard  
Suite 950  
Chicago, IL 60604

1 For Plaintiffs Cases 19 C 802, 19 C 1550, 19 C 1552, 19 C 1553,  
2 19 C 1554, 19 C 1588, 19 C 1598, 19 C 1600, 19 C 1601,  
3 19 C 1623, 19 C 1624, 19 C 1625, 19 C 1626, 19 C 1695,  
4 19 C 1697, 19 C 1698, 19 C 1701, and 19 C 1703:

5 MR. AUSTIN BARTLETT  
6 BartlettChen LLC  
7 150 N. Michigan Avenue  
8 Suite 2800  
9 Chicago, IL 60601

10 For Plaintiffs Cases 19 C 802, 19 C 1588, 19 C 1598, 19 C 1600,  
11 19 C 1623, 19 C 1624, 19 C 1697, 19 C 1698, 19 C 1701, and  
12 19 C 1703:

13 MR. MANUEL von RIBBECK  
14 Ribbeck Law Chartered  
15 Lake Point Tower  
16 505 N. Lake Shore Drive  
17 Suite 102  
18 Chicago, IL 60611

19 For Plaintiff  
20 Kartikawati:

21 MR. PETER J. FLOWERS  
22 Meyers & Flowers LLC  
23 3 N. Second Street  
24 Suite 300  
25 Saint Charles, IL 60174

For the Defendant:

MS. BATES McINTYRE LARSON  
Perkins Coie LLP  
131 S. Dearborn Street  
Suite 1700  
Chicago, IL 60603

MR. MACK H. SHULTZ JR.  
Perkins Coie LLP  
1201 3rd Avenue  
Suite 4900  
Seattle, WA 98101

Court Reporter:

LAURA R. RENKE, CSR, RDR, CRR  
Official Court Reporter  
219 S. Dearborn Street, Room 1432  
Chicago, IL 60604  
312.435.6053  
laura\_renke@ilnd.uscourts.gov

1 (In open court.)

2 THE CLERK: Okay. 18 C 7686, Saputra v. Boeing;  
3 18 C 8006, Satijo v. Boeing; 19 C 622, Gitelson v. Boeing;  
4 19 C 797, Kurniawati v. Boeing; and 19 C 802, Irianto v.  
5 Boeing.

6 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. Why don't we  
7 start first with the Boeing attorneys, and then I'll go through  
8 each plaintiff attorney. So for Boeing, who do we have?

9 MR. SHULTZ: Mack Shultz for The Boeing Company.

10 MS. LARSON: Good morning, your Honor. Bates Larson,  
11 also on behalf of The Boeing Company.

12 THE COURT: All right. Now, for plaintiffs, why don't  
13 you identify yourselves and state who the -- which case you're  
14 associated with.

15 MR. BARTLETT: Your Honor, Austin Bartlett with Manuel  
16 von Ribbeck on behalf of plaintiff Irianto.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. DEMETRIO: Good morning, Judge Durkin. Michael  
19 Demetrio and Mr. Andrew Stevens of Corboy & Demetrio on behalf  
20 of plaintiff Gitelson.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. ROUTH: Good morning, your Honor. Tom Routh of  
23 the Nolan Law Group on behalf of plaintiff Satijo.

24 MR. WRONA: Good morning, your Honor. John Wrona from  
25 Gardiner, Koch, Weisberg & Wrona on behalf of plaintiff Fahrida

1 Kurniawati.

2 MR. HART: Good morning, your Honor. Steven Hart,  
3 Hart, McLaughlin & Eldridge. We have two cases now in state  
4 court that we believe will be removed and before you shortly.  
5 Those are the Estate of Hantoro and the Estate of Sitharesmi.

6 THE COURT: Okay.

7 MR. BARTLETT: Judge, on that note, just to advise the  
8 Court, there's about, I think, 17 more cases of ours that the  
9 good folks at Boeing will be removing shortly.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. FLOWERS: Good morning, your Honor. Pete Flowers  
12 on behalf of a case that's being removed. I wasn't going to  
13 step up since I didn't have an appearance on file. But it's  
14 the Kartikawati case.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 COURT REPORTER: Spell that for me.

17 MR. FLOWERS: K-A-R-T-I-K-A-W-A-T-I.

18 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

19 THE COURT: All right. Anyone else?

20 And for the record, I know Mr. Demetrio just because  
21 my brother, I think, and -- was associated with his -- with the  
22 combined law firm of Corboy & Demetrio at one time before when  
23 the Clifford firm merged back with Corboy and then split up  
24 again. So -- and I've known --

25 MR. DEMETRIO: Indeed it did, your Honor.

1           THE COURT: And I've known Mr. Demetrio a number of  
2 years. We're business friends, if there is such a thing.  
3 We're not personal friends. He's never been to my house; I've  
4 never been to his. But I'll make it as a matter of disclosure.

5           Okay. Well, we have -- last time you were here, you  
6 had previewed that there'd be a number -- there were a number  
7 of state court cases that would be removed to federal court.  
8 Apparently there's still a number of them in state court that  
9 are going to be -- you intend to remove on behalf of Boeing.

10          MR. SHULTZ: Yes, your Honor. Would it be helpful if  
11 I summarized at least what we knew about the status of the  
12 litigation?

13          THE COURT: Sure.

14          MR. SHULTZ: So as the Court is aware, there's five  
15 cases currently pending in federal court. I believe each are  
16 represented by different counsel.

17               We are aware of 24 cases currently pending in Cook  
18 County. 17 are -- have been filed by Mr. Bartlett and  
19 Mr. Ribbeck. We'll be removing those in the next two weeks, we  
20 expect, your Honor.

21               The case filed by Mr. Flowers was filed, I believe,  
22 about ten days ago. Boeing has not yet been served by that --  
23 with that case. We expect to remove it once it is.

24               There is the case filed -- two cases filed by Mr. Hart  
25 last week. Those cases we've agreed to waive service once we

1 receive the appropriate form. And we expect to remove those.

2 There are also four additional cases that were filed  
3 in state court on February 27th by the Edelson firm and  
4 Girardi & Keese. We have not yet been served with those.

5 So in total, there are 24 pending cases in state  
6 court, 17 of which will be removed in the next two weeks, and  
7 the remaining seven will be removed once we're served.

8 THE COURT: Okay. And do any of the state court cases  
9 involve my brother?

10 MR. SHULTZ: Not --

11 THE COURT: Or the Clifford Law Office?

12 MR. SHULTZ: No.

13 MR. BARTLETT: No.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Again, I can't predict what will  
15 happen in the future, and I don't know what would happen if his  
16 firm filed a case in state court, it got removed and assigned  
17 to me. I'm not sure what I'll do. But that raises a conflict  
18 issue that I may not -- I'll have to deal with, and we'll see  
19 what happens.

20 Okay. But I just wanted to make sure no case has been  
21 filed by the Clifford Law Office against Boeing, as far as you  
22 know.

23 MR. SHULTZ: Not with respect to this matter, your  
24 Honor.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Yeah. Okay. I understand.

1           Well, I think what will happen to all of your cases,  
2 they'll be randomly assigned when they come over. Even if you  
3 say they're related to the lowest number case, the way the  
4 clerk's office has been doing it is they randomly assign them.  
5 And then there's a motion to reassign, which is filed before  
6 me, and I grant it so that all of the cases come before a  
7 single judge, in this case me.

8           There is a motion to sequence discovery which was  
9 filed as to the first case by Boeing. The plaintiff in that  
10 case, Mr. Wisner's firm, said they didn't object to it. But  
11 they thought, and I agreed with them, that I shouldn't enter  
12 such an order until we had either more or all of the plaintiff  
13 attorneys in the case to see whether they objected to the  
14 sequencing of discovery. And I agree with that. Everyone  
15 ought to have their say on that before I --

16           MR. DEMETRIO: Can I make --

17           THE COURT: -- do anything.

18           MR. DEMETRIO: -- one comment for the record, Judge  
19 Durkin --

20           THE COURT: Sure.

21           MR. DEMETRIO: -- is Boeing has filed that motion in  
22 the Gitelson case also and just attached the previous filed  
23 motion. I wanted the Court to be aware that we also object to  
24 that motion for several reasons.

25           THE COURT: Okay. So there's at least -- I know the

1 Wisner firm did not, I think, last time we were here. But  
2 there is at least one objection from -- possible -- I expect  
3 there will be many objections. But at least for the record,  
4 one party is objecting to the motion to sequence discovery, to  
5 restrict it to *forum non conveniens* issues. That's correct?

6 MR. DEMETRIO: That's correct.

7 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

8 Well, then what I will do is set a briefing schedule.  
9 There's no reason we can't at least start the process of  
10 getting briefs in on that issue.

11 I'm not going to -- they -- they presented a fairly  
12 lengthy brief explaining why they think it was appropriate and  
13 cited a number of cases, and you ought to have an opportunity  
14 to respond to that.

15 I expect you may want to coordinate so we don't get  
16 multiple briefs, and people coming in late may just say "me  
17 too" and add something if they want to. But you're all good  
18 firms, and I'm sure that, you know, a combined effort by you  
19 may account for the arguments anyone would make.

20 It makes -- to me, that makes more sense than waiting  
21 for all these cases to filter their way back to me. Any  
22 objection to doing that? I guess I'm asking specifically to  
23 the people that are -- have cases before me right now.

24 MR. ROUTH: No objection, your Honor.

25 MR. WRONA: No.



1 MR. BARTLETT: No objection.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Demetrio, you agree?

3 MR. DEMETRIO: Yes, I agree.

4 THE COURT: Well, then I will let -- how much time do  
5 you want to respond to their motion? And I'll suggest that you  
6 do it as a single brief on behalf of multiple plaintiffs.  
7 Doesn't mean you're all in -- you know, there's no class action  
8 or anything. It doesn't mean you're all in the -- doing  
9 anything other than filing a brief for convenience' purposes  
10 that relates to arguments you're all bringing.

11 MR. DEMETRIO: Well, Judge, I certainly don't mind  
12 helping any party in the case. I think that each plaintiff may  
13 be in a slightly different posture --

14 THE COURT: On this?

15 MR. DEMETRIO: -- procedurally given this motion.

16 So --

17 THE COURT: How so? I'm not -- I -- the -- it would  
18 seem to me the issue of discovery in full or discovery for  
19 *forum non conveniens* purposes is an issue that all the  
20 plaintiffs share equally. Boeing's position is -- applies to  
21 all of you. I would think the response would be similar unless  
22 people want to, you know, take a hand at drafting a different  
23 argument that covers the same area.

24 MR. DEMETRIO: Yeah. The only thing I'm aware of  
25 right now -- I haven't had a chance to talk to Mr. Wisner -- is

1 with respect to the Gitelson case, plaintiffs have complied  
2 with your order with respect to the Court-directed discovery.  
3 I don't know what posture the other cases before you are at  
4 this point.

5 I think that's a salient point and a response that I  
6 may file in front of you.

7 THE COURT: What do you mean they've complied? I'm  
8 not sure I understand.

9 MR. DEMETRIO: Well, your -- you sent us an order with  
10 respect to the project for Court-initiated discovery.

11 THE COURT: I waived that, though, for this case --

12 MR. DEMETRIO: Oh. I didn't get that order.

13 THE COURT: -- mandatory disclosures. No, I -- well,  
14 it was on the record last time.

15 MR. DEMETRIO: Well, and that's fine.

16 THE COURT: Yeah.

17 MR. DEMETRIO: I filed -- or directed my answers and  
18 filed the certificate before you yesterday.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MR. DEMETRIO: So, I mean, it's just progress, I  
21 guess.

22 THE COURT: No, it is.

23 MR. DEMETRIO: So --

24 THE COURT: I just -- I -- my recollection is I waived  
25 the mandatory disclosure obligations both sides had.

1           MR. DEMETRIO: That may have happened before I was  
2 before you. But I --

3           THE COURT: It did.

4           MR. DEMETRIO: -- did get an order from you, from this  
5 Court, saying "Comply with this program."

6           THE COURT: And here's the problem. And it's not  
7 anyone else's fault other than the way the clerk's office  
8 works. All cases that are filed in the district get that  
9 order. I am -- I can waive the obligations that --

10          MR. DEMETRIO: Okay.

11          THE COURT: -- the mandatory disclosure project --  
12 it's a -- it's not anything under the Federal Rules. It's a  
13 project this district has adopted for pilot purposes. I can  
14 waive that in appropriate cases, especially when there's  
15 challenges to jurisdiction or venue.

16                I did waive it last time.

17          MR. DEMETRIO: Okay.

18          THE COURT: You got that order because it's --  
19 everybody gets it. And -- and so we'll make explicit in our  
20 minute order of today's proceedings that the mandatory  
21 disclosure obligations are waived at this time so that nobody  
22 is -- I don't want anybody doing any work on this relating to  
23 discovery until I decide the issue of what discovery is  
24 appropriate. So I'll make that clear.

25                And thank you for bringing that up because I'm sure

1 every one of you is going to get that same order, which is sent  
2 out automatically by the clerk's office.

3 MR. DEMETRIO: Okay.

4 THE COURT: So ...

5 MR. BARTLETT: Your Honor, there was one other issue I  
6 had --

7 THE COURT: Yeah.

8 MR. BARTLETT: -- just for point of clarification.  
9 While the parties are briefing the motion to sequencing  
10 discovery, we desired to conduct discovery from third parties,  
11 written discovery. So I don't think it would be particularly  
12 onerous on any parties to this case, and indeed the discovery  
13 wouldn't be directed to the parties in this case, but the  
14 issues that would be relevant, I believe, both to *forum non*  
15 *conveniens*, as well as the merits in this case.

16 THE COURT: Well, who are you talking about?

17 MR. BARTLETT: Sure. One example would be Southwest  
18 Airlines, the largest customer in the world of the 737 MAX  
19 airplane. They have information, I believe, that's germane to  
20 the issues before this Court.

21 The Federal Aviation Administration.

22 I may as well some component part manufacturers.

23 Those are some of the universe of people that I think  
24 are in play.

25 THE COURT: What's the view of Boeing? You're not the

1 third party getting the subpoena and having to do the work, but  
2 what's your view?

3 MR. SHULTZ: Your Honor, to the extent that the  
4 proposed discovery would go beyond the issues that are  
5 presented by our forthcoming *forum non conveniens* motion, we  
6 would think it's premature to engage in that discovery at that  
7 time and would be a diversion of the parties' and the Court's  
8 resources.

9 THE COURT: Well, the problem is that third parties --  
10 you've committed to preserve all relevant records. Third  
11 parties haven't. And I think it's important -- I'm going to  
12 allow you to issue the discovery.

13 MR. BARTLETT: Thank you, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Note that it is for purposes of  
15 preservation, not for production. I want them to preserve the  
16 information you are requesting. But until I decide the scope  
17 of discovery and whether it's going to be me making a decision  
18 ultimately on how this case proceeds or some other  
19 jurisdiction, I think it's important you have the opportunity  
20 to preserve things.

21 But I think the expense of production of it, I'm going  
22 to wait for another day once I've decided what the scope of  
23 discovery before me is going to be.

24 MR. BARTLETT: Very good. And so, your Honor, just so  
25 I can make sure I comply --

1 THE COURT: Yeah.

2 MR. BARTLETT: -- with this Court's orders, basically  
3 we're talking about sending them preservation letters as  
4 opposed to production requests.

5 THE COURT: However you want to do it.

6 MR. BARTLETT: Sure. Okay.

7 THE COURT: Whether you do it by way of a production  
8 request or a subpoena -- they're third parties, so it would be  
9 a subpoena.

10 MR. BARTLETT: Right.

11 THE COURT: But tell them in a cover letter that the  
12 Court is not requiring production at this time but simply that  
13 you preserve those documents, whatever you think is going to be  
14 paid attention to more by the third parties.

15 MR. BARTLETT: Very good.

16 THE COURT: If a subpoena gets their attention more  
17 than a production -- or a preservation notice, I'm fine with  
18 you issuing a subpoena as long as you put in your cover letter  
19 that production of the documents is not required at this time,  
20 merely preservation.

21 MR. BARTLETT: Very good.

22 THE COURT: Will that protect your interests?

23 MR. BARTLETT: It will. Thank you.

24 THE COURT: Okay. I think that's why you want to do  
25 this.

1 MR. BARTLETT: That's right.

2 THE COURT: So all plaintiffs have leave to do that.  
3 But, you know, you shouldn't -- there's no need to send ten  
4 subpoenas to Southwest. If one is going on behalf of everyone  
5 else, they're going to save the documents.

6 MR. BARTLETT: We'll coordinate.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. BARTLETT: Yes.

9 THE COURT: Great.

10 Are there cases pending in other jurisdictions?

11 MR. SHULTZ: Not to Boeing's knowledge, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 MR. SHULTZ: We've been wondering if one would be  
14 filed in another state that would put this into the MDL  
15 process, but --

16 THE COURT: Well, I was too.

17 MR. SHULTZ: -- so far -- so far there has not been.

18 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

19 Well, sometimes it doesn't work that way. Mr. Hart  
20 knows this from the case under the chicken -- chicken antitrust  
21 case I have where it's not an MDL because everyone sued in  
22 Chicago, and there's 30 of them or 40 of them. So -- but it  
23 doesn't matter. It's going to be in front of one judge one way  
24 or the other.

25 Okay. So how much time do plaintiffs want to respond

1 to the motion to sequence discovery?

2 MR. DEMETRIO: Judge, listening to everything that  
3 we've been informed of here, for coordination purposes, I was  
4 going to suggest, just to get everybody involved and, you know,  
5 cut down on paperwork and electronics before the Court,  
6 60 days.

7 THE COURT: That's fine. It delays the case, but the  
8 plaintiffs are asking for it. I understand you're -- you've  
9 got a lot of people to coordinate with and -- so 60 days is  
10 fine.

11 Everyone else agrees to that?

12 MR. ROUTH: Yes, your Honor.

13 THE COURT: On the plaintiff side.

14 Any objection from Boeing?

15 MR. SHULTZ: No, your Honor.

16 THE COURT: All right. So 60 days takes us to when,  
17 Sandy?

18 THE CLERK: Maybe May 6th.

19 THE COURT: Okay. And how much time do you want to  
20 file a reply?

21 MR. SHULTZ: 21 days, your Honor.

22 THE COURT: That's fine.

23 THE CLERK: I think that takes us to Memorial Day. So  
24 the day after, which would be the 28th.

25 THE COURT: Okay. So that will be fully briefed by



1 May 28th. There will be a written ruling.

2 What I'll likely do is I'll set you for a status in  
3 late June to give me a target date to give you a ruling on  
4 that. I hate to keep delaying things because people want to  
5 move ahead with this. But as long as the documents and  
6 anything else are being preserved, there's no prejudice in the  
7 overall sense of this case, as long as everybody hangs on to  
8 what they have. So I'll give you a late June date for a  
9 ruling.

10 THE CLERK: How is June 27th for everybody, 9:00?

11 MR. BARTLETT: Perfect.

12 MR. DEMETRIO: That's fine, Judge.

13 MR. ROUTH: That will work.

14 MR. WRONA: Yes.

15 THE COURT: Okay. And I think as other cases get  
16 reassigned to me, get removed from state court, that schedule  
17 is going to remain the same. If someone feels they -- everyone  
18 will be covered by any order I make. But if anyone thinks upon  
19 the filing of the brief by the group of plaintiff lawyers who  
20 are going to be involved in it that someone needs to file  
21 something beyond just a "me too" brief, ask for leave to do it,  
22 and you can explain why you have a different position that  
23 isn't covered in the brief that's been filed by plaintiffs.

24 MR. SHULTZ: Your Honor, just from a technical  
25 perspective, is there one matter that we should file in as a

1 lead case or --

2 THE COURT: Yes.

3 MR. SHULTZ: I'm concerned about -- I mean, we're  
4 presently in a situation where we're worried about having to  
5 file our motion to sequence discovery in each case as we remove  
6 them and the potential for having to file the motion  
7 technically in all of the cases, all of the briefing.

8 THE COURT: We did this in the chicken antitrust cases  
9 too where we have a single number as the number for the case.  
10 So the low number, which I believe is the Saputra case, which I  
11 think is the first one we had, that will be the number.  
12 18 CV 7686 will be the number that will apply to all filings in  
13 this case, even though individual plaintiffs will have their  
14 own case.

15 So no one loses the fact of a case, but for filing  
16 purposes, people should use that low number. And we'll put an  
17 order out to that effect too.

18 So there is no need -- so it's very clear, there's no  
19 need to file multiple briefs that are identical in each one of  
20 these cases.

21 MR. SHULTZ: And, again, just raising technical  
22 questions. Should all the plaintiffs' counsel appear in that  
23 case so that electronic service is effective on everybody  
24 through the Saputra case?

25 THE COURT: Probably. We'll give you an order that

1 will describe how you need to do that.

2 MR. SHULTZ: Okay.

3 THE COURT: I'm just going to have to figure out how  
4 we did that in the -- in that other antitrust case. But it  
5 works effectively in that case where everyone gets notice under  
6 the low number in that one case. And I want to do the same  
7 here. So we'll put that in the order somehow and make sure  
8 that there are not multiple -- everyone gets notice of anything  
9 filed in the case, and there's no multiple filings.

10 This all leads up to -- I -- well, the other question  
11 I have, on the plaintiffs' side, is anyone going to file a  
12 motion to remand?

13 (No response.)

14 THE COURT: Hearing none --

15 MR. BARTLETT: So a motion to remand.

16 THE COURT: Back to state court.

17 MR. BARTLETT: Right. No, I think that the only  
18 person who probably evaluated that and may have caused some  
19 pause was -- was at least us. And, no, we will not be moving  
20 to remand.

21 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

22 I'm not saying you can't, but, you know, the law is  
23 pretty clear on why the cases are here right now.

24 MR. BARTLETT: Yeah.

25 THE COURT: So -- but I just wanted to make sure

1 because that adds a new wrinkle to the timing.

2 All right. I need to know -- and you can do it by way  
3 of a status. Boeing will know this first -- if you are sued  
4 anywhere else so that the issue of this being an MDL is raised.  
5 Please just file a status report with the Court --

6 MR. SHULTZ: Absolutely.

7 THE COURT: -- copying everyone, but -- or at least  
8 filing it, and hopefully the notice will go to every attorney  
9 in the case that way.

10 MR. SHULTZ: Certainly.

11 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

12 Do you anticipate -- your intelligence network on the  
13 plaintiffs' side is probably pretty good on this. Do you  
14 anticipate many more of these cases being filed in state court?  
15 There were over 180 people that passed away, I think.

16 MR. HART: Yes, your Honor.

17 THE COURT: And as I read it, everyone is from  
18 Malaysia [sic] except for one pilot from India and one  
19 passenger from Italy. So there are no U.S. plaintiffs. And I  
20 would expect most people -- if some people are suing, there's  
21 probably going to be a lot more. There's no way to expedite  
22 that because I imagine it involves the plaintiffs or the  
23 families of the decedents contacting attorneys.

24 How long does that -- do you think this process will  
25 take before we have every plaintiff -- every putative

1 plaintiff, anyone who intends to sue, in court? Any way of  
2 even predicting that?

3 MR. ROUTH: I don't believe so, your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Okay. And we don't even know if it would  
5 be here. Certainly people could sue -- well, where else could  
6 you sue in this case? Boeing's the single defendant, correct?

7 MR. SHULTZ: Boeing is the single defendant named in  
8 these proceedings, yes.

9 In -- obviously, there may be proceedings in  
10 Indonesia. We don't know whether any have been commenced or  
11 not that might involve the airline there --

12 THE COURT: Yeah.

13 MR. SHULTZ: -- or other parties there.

14 THE COURT: You can get sued in Seattle too, couldn't  
15 you?

16 MR. SHULTZ: I hesitate to speculate --

17 THE COURT: Yeah --

18 MR. SHULTZ: -- as to --

19 THE COURT: -- I know.

20 MR. SHULTZ: -- where --

21 THE COURT: That's a --

22 MR. SHULTZ: -- Boeing might be subject to personal  
23 jurisdiction, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: At least that's a potential.

25 MR. DEMETRIO: Everywhere would be the answer.

1 THE COURT: Yeah. Well, your corporate headquarters  
2 is here. I don't know if your principal place of business  
3 is -- what have courts determined to be the principal place of  
4 business, here or Seattle?

5 MR. SHULTZ: Most often, if Boeing is the sole  
6 defendant, we are sued in Chicago, your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Okay. All right.  
8 Where are you incorporated?

9 MR. SHULTZ: Delaware.

10 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

11 Well, who knows where else you can get sued. But it  
12 looks like the lion's share is going to -- or the majority is  
13 going to come here. Okay.

14 Well, we have a June 27th status date. Is there  
15 anything else we ought to discuss today? First from  
16 plaintiff -- from plaintiffs. Anything else?

17 MR. BARTLETT: Your Honor, just one housekeeping  
18 motion. We had -- my co-counsel from Colson Hicks, they had  
19 filed a motion to withdraw from our cases. All the plaintiffs  
20 are still going to be represented by my firm as well as  
21 Mr. Ribbeck's firm. So that was noticed for today. So --

22 THE COURT: All right. That motion will be granted.

23 MR. BARTLETT: Yeah, okay.

24 THE COURT: Anything else from the plaintiffs  
25 otherwise?

1 MR. ROUTH: No, your Honor.

2 MR. DEMETRIO: No, your Honor, but our thanks.

3 THE COURT: Okay. How about Boeing? Anything else?

4 MR. SHULTZ: No, your Honor. Thank you very much.

5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you all.

6 MULTIPLE COUNSEL: Thank you, Judge.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 (Concluded at 9:43 a.m.)

9 C E R T I F I C A T E

10 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the  
11 record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

12

13 /s/ LAURA R. RENKE  
14 LAURA R. RENKE, CSR, RDR, CRR  
Official Court Reporter

April 1, 2019

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25